

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **December 22, 2003**, the examiner reviewed claims 25-51. The specification was objected to because it did not conform with 37 C.F.R. 1.77(b). Claims 25, 34, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Zizzi (USPN 6,185,681 B1, hereinafter "Zizzi"). Claims 26-28, 33, 35-37, 42, 44-46, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of Sutter (USPN 5,924,094, hereinafter "Sutter"). Claims 29, 38, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of Sutter and further in view of Brogliatti et al (USPN 6,564,225 B1, hereinafter "Brogliatti"). Claims 30-32, 39-41, and 48-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zizzi in view of Sutter and further in view of Bjerrum et al (USPN 5,311,595, hereinafter "Bjerrum").

### **Objections to the specification**

The specification was objected to because it did not conform with 37 C.F.R. 1.77(b).

Applicant has amended the specification to conform with 37 C.F.R. 1.77. Applicant notes that the text of 37 C.F.R. 1.77 that was supplied in the Office Action is not identical with the text of 37 C.F.R. 1.77 as presented on the USPTO web site (see [http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/consolidated\\_rules.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/consolidated_rules.pdf), page R-61). Applicant has used the text of 37 C.F.R. 1.77 as presented on the USPTO web site in making these amendments.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Independent claims 25, 34, and 43 were rejected as being anticipated by Zizzi. Applicant respectfully points out that Zizzi teaches encrypting documents

in an electronic document system (see Zizzi, Abstract). Zizzi, however, does not teach **creating a digest** of the data to detect tampering.

In contrast, the present invention **creates a digest** of the data to detect tampering (see page 8, lines 4-12 of the instant application). Creating a digest of the data is beneficial because it provides a secure technique for detecting tampering. There is nothing within Zizzi that suggests creating a digest of the data to detect tampering. Additionally, there is nothing within Sutter, Brogliatti, or Bjerrum, either separately or in concert with Zizzi, which suggests creating a digest of the data to detect tampering.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 25, 34, and 43 to clarify that the present invention creates a digest of the data to detect tampering. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 4-12 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 25, 34, and 43 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 26-33, which depend upon claim 25, claims 35-42, which depend upon claim 34, and claims 44-51, which depend upon claim 43, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: January 29, 2004

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665